



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

. . . The judiciary committee of the Massachusetts legislature has reported adversely on the bill introduced early in the session providing for the establishment of an industrial court, resembling that in operation in New Zealand, for the settlement of labor difficulties.

. . . A petition has been presented to President Roosevelt, signed by more than a thousand American women living in all sections of the country, — women who travel abroad, — protesting against the intolerable and humiliating treatment to which returning travelers are subjected in the custom houses. Ample ground has recently been given for such a protest.

. . . Ernest Howard Crosby, with whose fine work our readers are familiar, is getting in some of his best blows at militarism in the *Whim*, an unconventional pocket magazine published at Newark, N. J., with whose editorial staff he has recently become connected.

. . . In an address before the Twentieth Century Club of Boston, on February 5, Mr. Edwin D. Mead declared war to be the great anarchist. "It makes virtues of killing, arson and theft. It turns all morality upside down. Every army is a school of cruelty, licentiousness and drunkenness, and pours thousands of demoralized men back among the people. If we can overcome and eradicate this cardinal anarchy of war, the lesser anarchies will one by one surely disappear."

. . . The conflict in South Africa has been a frightful war on horses. Mr. Brodrick stated in the House of Commons on February 7 that the British government had bought during the war 446,038 horses, 77,101 of which came from the United States; and that in addition 89,705 had been captured from the Boers. Think of the awful cruelty and suffering involved in this more than half a million horses used up in the efforts of men to find and kill one another!

The "Secret History" of the American-Spanish War.

At a meeting of the International Arbitration and Peace Association held at 40 Outer Temple, Strand, London, England, February 25, it was resolved to issue the following memorandum on the recent statements concerning the circumstances leading up to the American-Spanish War:

"The further information upon the attitude of the British government on the eve of the outbreak of war between the United States and Spain has since been supplied by Lord Cranbourne's replies to Mr. Henry Norman in the House of Commons and by statements in the official press of Berlin, admitted or uncontradicted by the British government.

"Taken together, these different statements constitute an extraordinary revelation of the secret history of the period in question. It now appears that (1) in the opinion of the British Ambassador at Washington, the *doyen* of the foreign representatives, a tried friend of America and the most experienced diplomatist in the British service, the Spanish note of April 9, 1898, the real character of which only became publicly known

after the outbreak of hostilities, removed the last pretext for armed intervention by the United States government, and that the requisite reforms in the Spanish colonies could be secured by a continuance of pacific negotiations; (2) that Lord Pauncefoot called a meeting of ambassadors at the British Embassy on April 10, 1898, as a result of which an identical note was dispatched to the great powers, expressing this opinion and proposing further friendly representations to the United States government; (3) that the British government, in common with the German government and probably that of Russia also, not only refused to make any such pacific representations, in default of which a bloody and costly conflict that is not yet ended broke out, but has concealed these facts to this day from the public, which was thus left a helpless victim of the 'yellow press' and other groups of interested warmongers.

"We recall that all the governments above-named have signed (at The Hague) a solemn declaration that when a serious dispute occurs between two powers it is not only the right but the duty of the other and neutral powers to offer their good offices with a view to the settlement of the dispute. Believing firmly, as we do, in this right and duty of friendly mediation as an essential principle of international morality, we feel that we are but anticipating the verdict of history when we condemn this gross betrayal of the supreme interest of peace, which is common to all states, when we protest against the suppression of important political information, and when we express that better relations of the two great Anglo-Saxon countries cannot be assisted by any such policy as is indicated in this unhappy episode."

(This resolution indicates that the members of the International Arbitration and Peace Association believe that Lord Pauncefoot was actuated by the best of motives in his efforts to prevent the Spanish-American War, which the concessions of Spain had in his judgment rendered entirely unnecessary. His purpose was to secure a joint representation from the powers, in harmony with the provisions of the Hague Convention. The Association condemns the British government for not having acted in the way suggested by Pauncefoot. From this point of view, which is certainly the correct one, it was the British government, and not Lord Pauncefoot, that was our real enemy. — Ep.)

The Moral Responsibility of Nations.*

BY REV. MARTIN D. HARDIN.

I am glad to be of this company, here to remember the birthday of a man "sent from God." Memorial gatherings such as this cannot fail to have an influence for good. Would that only men who really love the name of Lincoln, and believe in the sanctity and permanency of his principles, were gathered to-night to honor his memory. I am almost tempted to hope that his departed spirit does not hear and know all that goes on in the land he served. It seems to me that a man of Lincoln's honesty and hatred of cant would groan, even in Paradise, if he knew of certain of those who will this night mouth his sacred name, for the sole purpose of giving a traditional respectability to selfish ambitions whose consummation will be the undoing of all that Lincoln loved.

* Address delivered before the Lincoln League of Minneapolis, Minn., February 12, 1902.

I have been asked to say a few words upon "The Moral Responsibility of Nations," a text certainly most appropriate for a Lincoln banquet, for, if ever there lived a statesman who believed that nations are morally accountable to a just God, it was Abraham Lincoln. He recognized as clearly as any Hebrew prophet of old that there is a moral order in the universe before which individuals and nations must bow in humble submission or pay to the last farthing for their transgressions of its demands. He knew that the scales of an exact justice could never be unbalanced. Hear him say: "If it must be that I must go down because of this speech, then let me go down linked to truth—die in the advocacy of what is right and just. This nation cannot live on injustice, a house divided against itself cannot stand." "This is a world of compensation, and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slaves." "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not themselves, and under a just God cannot long maintain it." "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

LINCOLN'S PECULIAR GENIUS.

These are characteristic words of this heroic man, whose very greatness lay in his power to disentangle ingenious lies, made for expediency's sake, from about each question, and to resolve the question into a form whereby it could be easily answered in the light of eternal moral principles. This was Lincoln's peculiar genius, that he brought all questions face to face with the moral law, and sought the solution in the light of God. He did not seek to find the expedient thing. He was not an opportunist. He did not ask what is the easy thing, or the popular thing,—what is the thing that an irresponsible, irrational destiny has decreed,—but simply this—What is right? From every problem he pulled away the irrelevant wrappings until it stood in its nakedness before the law of God. He, of all men, recognized most clearly that nations have deep and awful responsibilities which they must meet with fear and trembling, or suffer for their disobedience.

The permanency of our freedom is entirely dependent upon the amount of Lincoln spirit which can be kept alive in the breasts of the American people. Only as the majesty and the solemnity of the moral law inspire a wholesome fear of wrong will our heritage of liberty be kept safe. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom alike for nation and individual.

LONG WAY FROM THE IDEALS OF LINCOLN.

But when a representative, high in the counsels of our dominant party,* can proclaim the atheistic and anarchistic doctrine, "Our country, may she ever be right; but right or wrong, still our country;" when a United States senator in the name of patriotism can select such a sentence as a fit climax for his peroration in an appeal to Americans to sanction the policy of the government,—as was actually done in this city a year and a half ago, without a single note of protest from any man in his party,—and when much of the appeal in a national campaign is based upon the same low plain of prejudice and passion,—then we have, indeed, traveled as a people a long way from the ideals of Abraham

Lincoln; and have gone far into that country whose inhabitants know no law, human or divine, save the ungoverned impulses of their own ignorant selfishness.

What is the meaning of such a speech? Simply that my country, just because she is mine, can do no wrong; that she is a law unto herself, without obligations to God or man; that for her I hold a fool's devotion that makes me believe that she is mightier than God's eternal laws of righteousness; and if she once starts in a given course, I will follow her to the end, even though she violates every commandment of the decalogue. Those who cry out against her course in wrong, and would see her confined within the narrow limits of right, as discerned by the old foggy fathers, will be branded as traitors to their country, for the sole reason that they will not be swept from their ancient faith, and be willing, for patriotism's sake, to call a lie truth, and blind lawless commercialism the God of providence. If such a refusal is traitorous, let me to the end of time be branded with the honorable title.

A man who teaches the doctrine that our country must be followed, right or wrong, is more deserving of a place in the penitentiary than of a seat among our law-makers. He is the real traitor to every principle that has made our country worthy of respect and love. If you ought always to do right, and I ought always to do right, and every individual man in the nation ought always to do right, can all those individuals club together and do toward another nation that which would be wrong for one man to do to another? Does the deed done by many men become right which done by one man would be wrong? The wisest statesmen have

SAME MORAL LAW FOR NATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS.

thought that the simple law of right binds individuals and nations alike. Franklin said, "I know of but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively." Charles Sumner, the prophet statesman, said: "The injunction, 'Love one another,' is as applicable to nations as to individuals. It is one of the great laws of heaven, and nations, like individuals, may measure their nearness to God by the conformity of their conduct to this duty. . . . The dark ages have not passed away; Erebus and black night, born of Chaos, still brood over the earth; nor can we hail the clear day until the hearts of nations are touched as the hearts of individual men, and all acknowledge the same law of Right."

If it is true, as Lincoln believed, and some others whose word was once seriously taken to be fairly good authority, that "This is a world of compensation"; that we get out of life what we put into life; that with what measure we mete it shall be measured to us again; that we shall be judged as we judge,—then we may well question what the future holds in store for us.

It is hard not to covet that which belongs to our neighbor, especially if he is weaker than we are. It is hard not to lie, if the lie will help us to get our hand on that which we covet. It is hard not to feel justified in murder when we have once fully persuaded ourselves that Providence intended our weaker brother's possessions for us anyhow. And it is wonderfully easy, when we have gotten ourselves into trouble, to turn around to the world and say: "Destiny got us in here, and we

* Senator Beveridge of Indiana.

are so piously inclined, so anxious to say, 'Thy will be done,' that here we will stay forever, even though to stay and carry out Thy plans and our plans, O Destiny, we must resort to some stringent measures, which before we got into full partnership with Providence were so horrible in our eyes that we actually went to war to put a stop to just such things." A nation whose sense of moral responsibility is so lightly felt that in two years' time that which was, for a century, universally condemned by the calm, unprejudiced conscience of the whole people, can be decked out in the garb of a hurrah patriotism, and worshiped as a god suddenly fallen from heaven, is certainly not altogether sane or sound.

SHOULD HAVE FULLER PLACE IN THE HEARTS OF AMERICANS.

To-night I lift up my voice in gratitude for the life of Abraham Lincoln. My prayer is that his spirit may somehow yet find a fuller place in the hearts of all Americans; that as a people we shall put less stress on externals; that we shall pin our faith less to markets and millions and might, and more to love, liberty and right. May we be simpler in our ideals, more democratic in our sympathies, humbler in our bearing before Almighty God. And, instead of the bullying, boastful swell-headedness, which has made many of our people act as if the fiats of Sinai were insignificant emanations from a tribal god, long since dead, may there come the heartfelt consciousness that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

Ministerial Incongruities.

BY WILLIAM T. OLIVER.

It is a strange and deplorable circumstance that the subject of peace is so feebly espoused by professed ministers of the Gospel. Many intelligent and thoughtful minds, with keen perceptions of various other forms of moral transgression, seem singularly veiled in relation to the monstrous and comprehensive evil of war. From the same lips that preach the theoretical doctrine of peace on earth and goodwill toward men are frequently heard sentiments that seem calculated to impress the minds of the hearers with the belief that a readiness to defend one's country on the battlefield is the highest type of virtue, and to become a great military leader is to attain to the most exalted of all human achievements.

It would, indeed, be hard to find a clergyman who would attempt to deny the inherent barbarity of carnal warfare. It is sometimes necessary, say those who palliate it, for the preservation of our liberties, the extension of Christ's kingdom on the earth, or the promotion of a higher civilization among less enlightened peoples.

The fact is seemingly overlooked by such that outward liberty, although a precious boon, is of far less significance than that form of freedom enjoyed by those whom the truth makes free,—a liberty which is always forfeited by disobedience to divine commands. Time was when prison walls, or even death, were often preferred to any course of action that would tend to jeopardize the possession of this highest and dearest liberty.

The popular expression, "My country, right or wrong," reverses our Saviour's injunction, "But seek ye first the

kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." There is a love of country which is at once reasonable and commendable, but one should beware lest an overlove of this or any other earthly blessing loosen one's unreserved allegiance to Him from whom all blessings flow. If we believe in the truth of the Scripture proverb, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people," then, surely, we must admit that he who preaches unconditional righteousness teaches the highest form of patriotism.

Why is it not just as incumbent on Christians to avoid causing their (presumably) erring fellow-mortals to die in their sins on the field of battle as to send missionaries into the wilds lest the heathen die without a knowledge of the Gospel? Is not the possible sacrifice involved in both cases equally commendable? If this incongruity were generally recognized, we should be spared the repulsive spectacle of professed Christians opposing each other on the field of slaughter, and each side praying to a supposed "God of battles" for victory, and the conquerors glorying with unholy jubilations over the calamity of the vanquished foe!

The fact that a more advanced civilization oftentimes follows in the wake of conquest leads to the popular belief that war has an uplifting tendency on the world at large. But wrong-doing is often overruled for good, which circumstance, however, does not excuse the sin of the offender. It is belittling to the attributes of the Almighty to assume that some of His designs can be worked out only by means of a method involving a complication of gross immoralities. This feeling is coupled with the assurance that in every such instance a far greater benefit would accrue if Christian diplomacy were substituted for the sword. The stigma of a professed Christian nation making use of un-Christian methods for spreading its influence abroad would be thereby avoided.

The late Civil War is continually held up as being eminently just and wholly unavoidable. While admitting that it was much more excusable than many other wars, at least as far as the motive was concerned, yet it may be viewed, after all, as a direct consequence of the apathy that previously existed among the churches on certain points. If the pure apostolic Christianity that sternly forbids all violations of the Golden Rule had been faithfully preached during the preceding years, the hearts of legislators and slaveholders might have been reached to such an extent that the shackles of the slave would have been released without recourse to the violence of the sword.

Christ's injunction to turn the other cheek to the hand of the smiter is often applied merely to the early years of the Christian faith by those who seem to forget that the self-abnegation required made it just as "impracticable" then as now. It is highly illogical to refer it to the millennium, for in that blissful period the smiter will be absent, and so there will then be no occasion for such an act of forbearance.

It is, indeed, lamentable to observe the various means used, under the cloak of "patriotism" and "justice," to keep alive the war spirit in the bosoms of men by those who, as professed oracles of the Prince of Peace, should be among the foremost to deal its death blow. We can hardly expect to appeal successfully to the worldly on